



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,337	01/31/2001	Anil K. Singhani	FIS9-2000-0281	5977

45828 7590 12/28/2004

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/773,337	Applicant(s) SINGHANI ET AL.	
	Examiner Brandon Hoffman	Art Unit 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 are pending in this office action.
2. Applicant's arguments filed November 18, 2004, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Starr (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,606).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Starr teaches a process/data processing system for managing business, technical and operational data which uses a single interface in a shared space environment over the Internet comprising the steps of:

- Providing a supplier portal from which new guests indicate, using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) of the supplier portal Web page, whether they are a registered user or not (col. 10, lines 13-21);
- Determining whether a guest is a registered user from input by the guest, and if not a registered user, prompting the guest to select "Register" to link to guest

registration (GR) where they can obtain a Web userid/password that enables them to register for any of global procurement applications available under the supplier portal (col. 10, lines 21-28);

- When a guest obtains a Web userid/password in GR, storing guest information in a GR data store (col. 10, lines 28-30);
- Determining whether any applications have been authorized for a registered guest and, if not, prompting the guest to register for restricted applications in a portal common registration (PCR) where information is stored in a PCR data store throughout an application's approval cycle (col. 10, lines 30-47);
- Accessing information from the GR data store to automatically build a customized home page for the guest, this home page being modified and updated as the guest's requests for access to applications get approved (col. 10, line 47 through col. 11, line 11);
- Determining whether approval is needed for a requested application and, if so, sending a request for approval to the application administrator and receiving a response from the application administrator (col. 11, lines 12-35); and
- Storing links to all applications for which the guest is approved, these links being reflected in the personalized supplier portal home page which displays a list of links to all of the applications for which the guest has been registered and authorized (col. 10, lines 4-12).

Regarding claim 2, Starr teaches further comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2136

- Defining 1 to n level approval cycles a user must go through to get authorized to access an application (col. 9, lines 20-30);
- Logging in by a registered guest by inputting the guest's userid/password once for each session, as long as applications requested by the guest are in a same realm (col. 8, lines 37-65); and
- Invoking by a logged in guest any of their approved applications by simply clicking the link to the desired application in the guest's customized home page (col. 8, lines 21-25).

Regarding claim 3, Starr teaches wherein the approval cycles are customizable for each application (col. 9, lines 26-30).

Regarding claim 4, Starr teaches wherein the approval cycles are defined for a section of an application, providing a finer level of access control (col. 9, lines 22-26).

Regarding claim 5, Starr teaches wherein application specific registration fields are defined so that a registration form, unique to an application, is displayed when a user requests access to an application (col. 8, lines 37-51).

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner believes it to be inherent that guests may bookmark applications for later access (because web interfaces can be bookmarked), further comprising the step of prompting by an application a guest to enter their userid/password for authentication against data stored in the GR data store when the

application is accessed using a bookmark (when a site is bookmarked that requires authentication, future accesses to the site will require re-authentication).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant argues:

- a. Independent claims 1 and 7 are not taught by Starr to include e-mail sent to a prospective approver, registering at the user level, and allowing generic registration for any industry (page 8, first paragraph).
- b. Claims 2-5 are not allowable for limitations such as:
 - i. Defining approval cycles, logging in with userid/password for each session as long as applications requested are in a same realm, and invoking an approved application by clicking a link from within the home page (**claim 2**)
 - ii. Customizable approval cycles (**claim 3**)
 - iii. The cycles are defined for a section of an application, providing a finer level of access control (**claim 4**), and
 - iv. Application specific registration fields are defined so that a registration form is displayed when a user requests access to an application (**claim 5**) (page 8, second paragraph through page 16, first paragraph and page 17, first paragraph through page 23, last paragraph).
- c. Claim 6 is impermissible hindsight based on examiners use of inherency to show book marking applications for later access and when returning to a

Art Unit: 2136

bookmarked site, being prompted to enter userid/password (page 23, last paragraph).

Regarding argument (a), examiner disagrees with applicant. Applicants mention limitations that are not taught by the cited prior art – examiner feels these limitations are not claimed as argued. For example, where in the independent claim is it cited that “e-mail is sent to prospective approvers,” or that the registration is “at the user level” as opposed to the “subscriber level,” or the supplier portal “allows generic registration and entitlement functions for any industry.”

Regarding argument (b), examiner disagrees with applicant. Applicant never provides a rationale as to why the cited art is erroneous. The applicant simply states that the limitations are not taught. Then applicant recites the whole section in the prior art where the rejection was applied. Examiner does not know how to interpret the cited sections based on the fact that the examiner was the one to cite said sections as being pertinent for the rejection of claims 1-7.

Regarding argument (c), examiner disagrees with applicant. The cited reference teaches presenting a web site to the subscriber as a user interface (col. 43, lines 26-58). It would stand to reason that the subscriber would want to book mark the site, just like users book mark other sites that they use often. As is known in the art, if a site requires authentication upon loading, the book-marked site will also require authentication upon loading. If it did not require authentication when bookmarked, everyone would book mark secure sites with the plan of accessing them later to circumvent the authentication. Therefore, the rejection of claim 6 stands.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Branda Repp

BH

E. L. Moise
EMMANUEL L. MOISE
PRIMARY EXAMINER